REMARKS

Claims 1 to 29 are pending after this amendment.

Applicants have amended claims 1-13, 15, and 17-20 in order to more particularly define the invention. The amendments were not necessitated by the claim rejections. Applicants make no admission as to the patentability or unpatentability of the originally filed claims.

Claims 21-29 have been added in order to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added.

The amendments and remarks presented herein are in response to the Office Action dated February 21, 2007.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 11, 18, and 19 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully submit that the 112 rejections have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 as allegedly being anticipated by Glommen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

"A method for tracking the use of resources on a website comprising the steps of:
a.) receiving a request for a resource, the request originating at a client;
b.) determining whether the request for the resource includes a visitor identifier;
c.) responsive to the request not including the visitor identifier:
assigning a new visitor identifier; and
sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client;
d.) categorizing data sent with the request for the resource; and
e.) repeating steps a-d until reaching a session expiration."

The claimed method tracks the use of resources on a website. A request for a resource is received, for example at a server. The request originates at a client. A determination is made as to whether the request includes a visitor identifier. An example of such a visitor identifier is a cookie, although other types of visitor identifiers can be used. If the request does not include a visitor identifier, a new visitor identifier is assigned; a redirection request is sent to the client along with the new visitor identifier. Data sent with the resource request can be categorized so as to track resource use. The steps of the method are repeated until the session expires.

The claimed redirection request is useful because it is a mechanism for forcing the client to contact the server a second time, this time with the new visitor identifier. In this way, the present invention is able to determine whether or not the client is accepting visitor identifiers: a client that does not accept visitor identifiers will be detected because the second request will omit the visitor identifier that was recently assigned and sent to the client. It is useful to know whether a client is accepting visitor identifiers because this can affect the reliability of resource usage tracking data received for that client. Data from clients that do not accept visitor identifiers can be

deemed less reliable than data from clients that do accept visitor identifiers. This ability is just one possible advantage that is enabled by the claimed invention.

Glommen fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations. Glommen merely describes a technique for generating an initial cookie if it is determined that a request does not already contain a cookie. Glommen fails to teach any mechanism for sending a redirection request responsive to the initial request not including a visitor identifier. In fact, there is no hint or suggestion for such a redirection request in Glommen, since there is no mention of any technique for determining the relative reliability of collected visitation data based on a determination as to whether the client is accepting visitor identifiers.

The Examiner stated that Glommen recites "responsive to the request not including the visitor identifier: assigning a new visitor identifier; and sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client" at column 8, lines 45-57 and 18-35. Applicants respectfully submit that, on the contrary, the cited portions of Glommen fail to provide any hint or suggestion of the recited limitations. Glommen merely states, "If the request has no cookie ... then the traffic analysis server generates an initial cookie." (Column 8, lines 45-47). The remainder of the cited paragraph merely describes initializing the path analysis data and providing the browser with image source from the requested website. (Column 8, lines 47-57).

Column 8, lines 18-35 also fails to describe any technique involving a redirection request. This portion of Glommen merely describes the situation where there is

a cookie for the website of the requested page, and therefore is not even relevant to step c) of claim 1 which relates to the situation where the request does not include a visitor identifier. Specifically, column 8, lines 18-35 of Glommen states that the browser determines there is a cookie and sends the cookie along with the page request. The file server processes the request, and the browser receives the website page and the returned cookie. The cookie can contain traffic analysis path data. The browser displays the HTML code and image source, and stores the traffic analysis cookie. None of these described operations provide any hint or suggestion of sending a redirection request responsive to the request not including a visitor identifier, as claimed herein.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1 as amended. Claim 18 recites limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 18 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 3, as amended, recites:

> "A method for tracking the use of resources on a website comprising the steps of:
> a.) receiving a request for a resource from a requestor, the requestor having an address;
> b.) determining whether the request for the resource included a do not repeat indicator;
> c.) responsive to the request including the do not repeat indicator, assigning a visitor identifier from the requestor's address;
> d.) categorizing data received with the request for the resource; and

e.) repeating steps a-d until reaching a session expiration."

The claimed method tracks the use of resources on a website. An entity, such as a server, receives a request for a resource from a requestor. The server determines whether the request includes a do not repeat indicator. This do not repeat indicator allows the server to recognize the requestor's refusal to accept visitor identifiers. When the indicator is detected, the server does not continue to try to send a new visitor identifier to the client, but instead assigns a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address. Data sent with the resource request can be categorized so as to track resource use. The steps of the method are repeated until the session expires.

The claimed determination as to whether the request includes a do not repeat indicator is useful because it is a mechanism for determining whether or not the client is accepting visitor identifiers and for avoiding an endless loop. A client that does not accept visitor identifiers will be detected after one redirection request, because the do not repeat indicator will be set. It is useful to know whether a client is accepting visitor identifiers because this can affect the reliability of resource usage tracking data received for that client. The claimed method provides a mechanism for determining whether a client is accepting visitor identifiers while avoiding an endless loop. Data from clients that do not accept visitor identifiers can be deemed less reliable than data from clients that do accept visitor identifiers. This ability is just one possible advantage that is enabled by the claimed invention.

Glommen fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations. Glommen merely describes a technique for generating an initial cookie if it is determined that a request does not already contain a cookie. The Examiner stated that Glommen describes determining whether the request included a do not repeat indicator at column 9, lines 7-22. On the contrary, the cited portion of Glommen merely describes handling of an expired cookie. Specifically, Glommen describes initialization of traffic analysis data for the website. Glommen further describes handling of a non-expired cookie. Specifically, Glommen describes updating of traffic path analysis data, including incrementing a site visit count and other processing. No mention is made in the cited portion, or in any other part of Glommen, of any do not repeat indicator or any other similar notion. In fact, nowhere in Glommen is there any mention of any equivalent technique that would provide the advantages conferred by the claimed invention.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 3 as amended. Claims 19 and 20 recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 3.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 3, 19, and 20 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 11, as amended, recites:

"A data collection server for tracking the use of resources on a website comprising:
a communication interface for receiving a request for a resource and sending a visitor identifier;

a cookie handler coupled to the communications interface for:
testing the request for the resource;
checking whether a do not repeat indicator is present in the request for the resource; and
assigning the visitor identifier;
a session controller coupled to the cookie handler for signaling a session end for a particular visitor identifier; and,
a repository for storing data sent with the request for the resource."

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitation that the cookie handler checks whether a do not repeat indicator is present in the request for the resource. As discussed above in connection with claim 3, there is no hint or suggestion of a do not repeat indicator in Glommen.

This limitation concerning the do not repeat indicator originally appeared in claim 13. In the rejection of claim 13, the Examiner stated that checking whether the do not repeat indicator is taught by Glommen at column 8, lines 35-45 and Fig. 7. On the contrary, the cited portion of Glommen merely describes receiving a request from a browser for a website page that is tagged with a traffic analysis code. The traffic analysis server then determines whether the request includes a cookie. No mention is made of any technique for checking whether a do not repeat indicator is present.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of claim 11 as amended. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 12 and 13 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 14 recites:

> "A method for tracking the use of resources on a website comprising the steps of:
> sending a request for a resource to a data collection server;
> in response to the request not including a visitor identifier:
> receiving a new visitor identifier and a redirection request from the data collection server;
> sending the request for a resource with the new visitor identifier to the data collection server; and,
> receiving the requested resource."

The claimed method tracks the use of resources on a website. A request for a resource is sent to a data collection server. If the request does not include a visitor identifier, a new visitor identifier is received from the server, along with a redirection request. The request is sent to the server with the new visitor identifier. The requested resource is then received.

The claimed redirection request is useful because it is a mechanism for forcing a second request for the resource, this time with the new visitor identifier. In this way, the data collection server is able to determine whether or not the requester (typically a client) is accepting visitor identifiers. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, it is useful for the data collection server to know whether a client is accepting visitor identifiers because this can affect the reliability of resource usage tracking data received for that client.

Glommen fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations. Glommen merely describes a technique for generating an initial cookie if it is determined that a request does not already contain a cookie. Glommen fails to teach any mechanism for receiv-

ing a redirection request. In fact, there is no hint or suggestion for such a redirection request in Glommen, since there is no mention of any technique for determining the relative reliability of collected visitation data based on a determination as to whether the client is accepting visitor identifiers.

The Examiner stated that Glommen recites "receiving a new visitor identifier and a redirection request from the data collection server" at column 8, lines 18-35. Applicants respectfully submit that, on the contrary, the cited portion of Glommen fails to provide any hint or suggestion of the recited limitations. Glommen merely states that the browser determines there is a cookie and sends the cookie along with the page request. The file server processes the request, and the browser receives the website page and the returned cookie. The cookie can contain traffic analysis path data. The browser displays the HTML code and image source, and stores the traffic analysis cookie. None of these described operations provide any hint or suggestion of receiving a redirection request as claimed herein.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 14. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 15 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 16 recites:

> "A method for tracking the use of resources on a website comprising the steps of:
> sending a request for a resource to a data collection server;
> in response to the request not including a visitor identifier:

receiving a do not repeat indicator and a redirection request from the data collection server;
sending the request for a resource with the do not repeat indicator to the data collection server; and,
receiving the requested resource."

Claim 16 is distinguishable from the cited reference for the reasons described above in connection with claim 14.

Claim 16 also recites, "in response to the request not including a visitor identifier: receiving a do not repeat indicator." As discussed above in connection with claim 3, the do not repeat indicator is useful because it is a mechanism for determining whether or not the client is accepting visitor identifiers and for avoiding an endless loop.

Glommen fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations. Glommen merely describes a technique for generating an initial cookie if it is determined that a request does not already contain a cookie. The Examiner stated that Glommen describes receiving a do not repeat indicator at column 9, lines 7-22. On the contrary, the cited portion of Glommen merely describes handling of an expired cookie. Specifically, Glommen describes initialization of traffic analysis data for the website. Glommen further describes handling of a non-expired cookie. Specifically, Glommen describes updating of traffic path analysis data, including incrementing a site visit count and other processing. No mention is made in the cited portion, or in any other part of Glommen, of any do not repeat indicator or any other similar notion. In fact, no-

where in Glommen is there any mention of any equivalent technique that would provide the advantages conferred by the claimed invention.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 16. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 17 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 21 to 29 have been added in order to more particularly define the invention. Support for the new claims can be found in the originally filed specification at, for example, paragraphs [0012], [0014], [0044], and [0045]. No new matter has been added.

On the basis of the above amendments, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicant's representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Brett Error, et al.

Dated: June 18, 2007

By: /Amir H. Raubvogel/
Amir H. Raubvogel
Reg. No. 37,070
820 Lakeview Way
Redwood City, CA 94062
Phone: (650) 209-4884
Fax: (650) 362-1800